Appl. No. 10/620,307

5

10

15

25

30

Amendment Date: June 5, 2006

Reply to Office Action of Mach 3, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

- 1. Applicant acknowledges that Claims 5 15 have been elected for Applicant has cancelled without prejudice Claims 1 - 4 examination. and 16 - 17 and will pursue those claims in one or more divisional applications.
- 2. Claims 6 11, 12, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has amended these claims to provide antecedent basis for the term vehicle computer. Applicant prays that these amendments meet with the Examiner's approval.
- 3. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Reeder (US Pat. No. 5,937,823) (Reeder '823). Applicant has amended Claims 5 and 11 to reflect the allowable subject matter found in Claims 10 and 15, respectively. Claims 10 and 15 have now been cancelled. Applicant believes that Claims 5 and 11 and their dependent claims now are distinguished from the art of record wherein each of these claims now provides for disabling a vehicle ignition control computer when a 20 radio receiver is disconnected. Accordingly, Applicant prays that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b) can now be withdrawn.
 - 4. Claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeder '823.

Applicant notes that Claims 5 and 11 are now distinguished over thhe art of record and are, as such, non-obvious. Since Claims 5 and 11 are nonobvious, all claims that stem from these claims must be found to be nonobvious as well (in re Fine). Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claims 7 and 13 under 35 USC 103 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/620,307

Amendment Date: June 5, 2006

Reply to Office Action of Mach 3, 2006

5. Applicant now presents new Claims 18 – 20 that include the distinguishing limitation of disabling a vehicle when a radio receiver connected to the vehicle ignition control computer is disconnected.

5

6. Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully submitted,

15

10

Jack I. J'maev

Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 45,669

20

Intellectual Property Development 14175 Telephone Ave. Suite L Chipa CA 91710

25 Chino, CA 91710